



**UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS
SISTEMA DE BIBLIOTECAS DA UNICAMP
REPOSITÓRIO DA PRODUÇÃO CIENTÍFICA E INTELECTUAL DA UNICAMP**

Versão do arquivo anexado / Version of attached file:

Versão do Editor / Published Version

Mais informações no site da editora / Further information on publisher's website:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1140%2Fepjc%2Fs10052-019-6800-x>

DOI: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6800-x

Direitos autorais / Publisher's copyright statement:

©2019 by Springer. All rights reserved.

DIRETORIA DE TRATAMENTO DA INFORMAÇÃO

Cidade Universitária Zeferino Vaz Barão Geraldo

CEP 13083-970 – Campinas SP

Fone: (19) 3521-6493

<http://www.repositorio.unicamp.br>



Search for resonant production of second-generation sleptons with same-sign dimuon events in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV

CMS Collaboration*

CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

Received: 23 November 2018 / Accepted: 20 March 2019 / Published online: 4 April 2019
 © CERN for the benefit of the CMS collaboration 2019

Abstract A search is presented for resonant production of second-generation sleptons ($\tilde{\mu}_L, \tilde{\nu}_\mu$) via the R -parity-violating coupling λ'_{211} to quarks, in events with two same-sign muons and at least two jets in the final state. The smuon (muon sneutrino) is expected to decay into a muon and a neutralino (chargino), which will then decay into a second muon and at least two jets. The analysis is based on the 2016 data set of proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV recorded with the CMS detector at the LHC, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} . No significant deviation is observed with respect to standard model expectations. Upper limits on cross sections, ranging from 0.24 to 730 fb , are derived in the context of two simplified models representing the dominant signal contributions leading to a same-sign muon pair. The cross section limits are translated into coupling limits for a modified constrained minimal supersymmetric model with λ'_{211} as the only nonzero R -parity violating coupling. The results significantly extend restrictions of the parameter space compared with previous searches for similar models.

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry (SUSY) [1–13] is an attractive extension of the standard model (SM) offering gauge coupling unification and a solution to the hierarchy problem. In SUSY, a symmetry between fermions and bosons is postulated that assigns a new fermion (boson) to every SM boson (fermion). These new particles are called superpartners or sparticles. The superpotential of a minimal SUSY theory can contain lepton and baryon number violating terms [10],

$$W_{\text{RPV}} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{ijk} L_i L_j \bar{E}_k + \lambda'_{ijk} L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k - \kappa_i L_i H_u + \frac{1}{2} \lambda''_{ijk} \bar{U}_i \bar{D}_j \bar{D}_k. \quad (1)$$

Here, $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are generation indices, L, Q and H_u are the lepton, quark, and up-type Higgs $SU(2)_L$ doublet superfields, respectively, and $\bar{E}, \bar{D}, \bar{U}$ are the charged lepton, down-type quark, and up-type quark $SU(2)_L$ singlet superfields, respectively. The $SU(2)_L$ weak isospin and $SU(3)_C$ color indices are suppressed. The terms associated with the coupling parameters λ, λ' , and κ would lead to lepton number violation, while the one linked to λ'' would cause baryon number violation. A combination of these terms would lead to a rapid decay of the proton, which is not observed. To preserve the proton stability, additional symmetries are introduced. A common choice is to introduce R -parity conservation (RPC), which forbids all the terms in Eq. (1). The R -parity of a particle is defined as $(-1)^{2s+3(B-L)}$ [8], where s, B , and L denote the spin, the baryon number, and the lepton number of the particle, respectively. However, there are other symmetries that can replace R -parity and keep the proton stable [14, 15]. SUSY theories in which R -parity conservation is not imposed are usually called R -parity violating (RPV) models. A detailed review of RPV SUSY can be found in Ref. [16]. In RPC SUSY models, sparticles can only be produced in pairs, and the lightest sparticle (LSP) is stable. If the LSP is neutral (e.g., the lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$), experimental signatures at hadron colliders usually involve a large amount of missing transverse momentum due to undetected LSPs. In RPV SUSY models, the signatures can differ greatly from RPC scenarios. The LSP can decay back into SM particles, and the strong exclusion limits for sparticles from RPC searches do not necessarily apply to RPV models. In addition, RPV models allow for different production mechanisms, such as the resonant production of sleptons from $q\bar{q}$ collisions, which will be investigated in this paper.

At the CERN LHC, sleptons – the scalar superpartners of leptons – can be produced in $q\bar{q}$ interactions as s -channel resonances via the trilinear $LQ\bar{D}$ term of the superpotential. The coupling strength of this interaction is characterized by λ'_{ijk} , where i specifies the lepton and j, k the quark generations. For proton–proton (pp) collisions at the LHC, the contributions

* e-mail: cms-publication-committee-chair@cern.ch

from the first quark generation ($j = k = 1$) are dominant. The lepton index determines which sleptons can be produced via this coupling. It also defines the possible decay modes of the LSP, since all decay modes of the LSP into SM particles must involve RPV couplings. Resonant slepton production was first proposed in Refs. [17–19] as a viable signature for RPV SUSY at hadron colliders. Detailed studies of resonant slepton production leading to a same-sign (SS) dilepton signature were presented in Refs. [20–22]. Resonant slepton production was also suggested as a possible explanation for observed deviations from the SM at the Tevatron and the LHC [23–25].

This paper focuses on the resonant production of second-generation sleptons ($\tilde{\mu}_L, \tilde{\nu}_\mu$) via the RPV coupling λ'_{211} in final states with an SS muon pair and jets. The search is based on $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collision data recorded in 2016 with the CMS detector at the LHC, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 35.9 fb^{-1} . Limits on resonant production of second-generation sleptons were set by the D0 collaboration [26] at the Fermilab Tevatron and in Ref. [27] reinterpreting ATLAS and CMS results. The results presented in this paper are the first bounds on resonant slepton production in this channel set by CMS. Assuming RPC, searches for pair production of charged sleptons exclude slepton masses up to 450 GeV for \tilde{e} and $\tilde{\mu}$ [28] and 500 GeV for \tilde{e} , $\tilde{\mu}$, and $\tilde{\tau}$ [29] if the left- and right-handed sleptons are mass degenerate and assuming a massless LSP. For the production of left-handed smuons only, the exclusion limits decrease to 280 GeV [28]. Searches for SUSY scenarios with two SS leptons and jets in the final state have been performed by ATLAS [30] and CMS [31] using pp collision data recorded in 2016 without finding any evidence for physics beyond the SM. While the search presented in Ref. [31] targets various RPC SUSY signals, this paper focuses on RPV SS dimuon signatures from resonant slepton production. The main experimental differences are related to the definition of the signal regions (SRs), the momentum thresholds for the muons, and the fact that no lower bound on the missing transverse momentum is applied here. A recent review of searches and bounds on RPV SUSY can be found in Ref. [32].

Based on a modified version of the constrained minimal SUSY model (cMSSM) [33] with λ'_{211} as an additional coupling, two of the dominant signal processes leading to an SS muon pair are shown in Fig. 1. Here, the LSP is assumed to be the lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, and all other RPV couplings are set to zero (single-coupling dominance). In the diagrams shown in Fig. 1, a smuon ($\tilde{\mu}_L$) or a muon sneutrino ($\tilde{\nu}_\mu$) is produced in $q\bar{q}$ ($u\bar{d}$, $\bar{u}d$, $d\bar{d}$) annihilation and decays into a muon and either the LSP neutralino ($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$) or the lightest chargino ($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$). The $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ will further decay into the LSP and a W boson. All decay chains in Fig. 1 end with the decay of the LSP into a second muon and two light quarks via an off-shell smuon ($\tilde{\mu}_L^*$) in an effective three-body decay. The decay of the $\tilde{\mu}_L^*$

involves the RPV coupling λ'_{211} , so that R -parity is violated in the production and the decay of the slepton. The probed values of λ'_{211} are large enough to ensure a prompt decay of the LSP. Because of the Majorana nature of the LSP, the second muon will have the same charge as the first one with a probability of 50%. Same-sign dilepton production is rare in the SM, and is therefore well suited as a signature for new physics searches.

For the signal models, a simplified model approach [34,35] is used, where the dominant signal contributions are extracted and simulated as independent signals assuming a branching fraction of 100%. One advantage of this approach is that the final exclusion limits are less model dependent than for one based strictly on the cMSSM, since the sparticle masses can be set to combinations not allowed in the cMSSM, and the signal contributions are split into the different production mechanisms and decay chains. The upper and lower diagrams of Fig. 1 will be called simplified model 1 (SM1) and simplified model 2 (SM2), respectively. Another important contribution to SS muon pair production via λ'_{211} in the modified cMSSM comes from a process similar to the one




Fig. 1 Signal contributions from a modified cMSSM with λ'_{211} as an additional coupling, which are considered as simplified signal models SM1 (upper) and SM2 (lower) in this search. The charge conjugate diagrams are included as well

shown in Fig. 1 (lower). In this process, a $\tilde{\mu}_L$ is produced and decays as $\tilde{\mu}_L \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \mu$ (instead of $\tilde{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \mu$). The $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ then decays into a Z boson and the LSP. As long as the W boson from Fig. 1 (lower) and the Z boson decay into quarks, there is no difference in analysis sensitivity between these processes. Therefore, exclusion limits of SM2 will also apply for this additional decay chain. The results of the search are interpreted in terms of SM1 and SM2 as well as the modified cMSSM.

2 The CMS detector and event reconstruction

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections. Forward calorimeters extend the pseudorapidity (η) coverage provided by the barrel and endcap detectors. Muons are detected in gas-ionization chambers embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in Ref. [36]. Events of interest are selected using a two-tiered trigger system [37]. The first level, composed of custom hardware processors, uses information from the calorimeters and muon detectors to select events at a rate of around 100 kHz within a time interval of less than 4 μ s. The second level, known as the high-level trigger, consists of a farm of processors running a version of the full event reconstruction software optimized for fast processing, and reduces the event rate to around 1 kHz before data storage.

The particle-flow algorithm [38] aims to reconstruct and identify each individual particle in an event, with an optimized combination of information from the various elements of the CMS detector. The energy of electrons is determined from a combination of the electron momentum at the primary interaction vertex as determined by the tracker, the energy of the corresponding ECAL cluster, and the energy sum of all bremsstrahlung photons spatially compatible with originating from the electron track. The energy of charged hadrons is determined from a combination of their momentum measured in the tracker and the matching ECAL and HCAL energy deposits, corrected for zero-suppression effects and for the response function of the calorimeters to hadronic showers. Finally, the energy of neutral hadrons is obtained from the corresponding corrected ECAL and HCAL energies. The missing transverse momentum vector \vec{p}_T^{miss} is defined as the projection onto the plane perpendicular to the beam axis of the negative vector sum of the momenta of all

reconstructed particle-flow objects in an event. Its magnitude is referred to as p_T^{miss} .

Hadronic jets are clustered from these reconstructed particles using the infrared and collinear safe anti- k_T algorithm [39,40] with a distance parameter of 0.4. The jet momentum is determined as the vectorial sum of all particle momenta in the jet, and is found from simulation to be within 5–10% of the true momentum over the whole transverse momentum (p_T) spectrum and detector acceptance [41]. Additional proton-proton interactions within the same or nearby bunch crossings can contribute additional tracks and calorimetric energy depositions to the jet momentum. To mitigate this effect, tracks identified to be originating from pileup vertices are discarded, and an offset factor is applied to correct for remaining contributions. Jet energy corrections are derived from simulation to bring the measured response of jets to that of particle level jets on average. In situ measurements of the momentum balance in dijet, photon+jet, Z+jet, and multijet events are used to account for any residual differences in jet energy scale in data and simulation. Additional selection criteria are applied to each jet to remove jets potentially dominated by anomalous contributions from various subdetector components or reconstruction failures. Jets are classified as originating from a bottom quark (b tagged) if they pass the medium working point requirements from the combined secondary vertex algorithm (v2) [42]. The medium working point is defined to have a misidentification probability of 1% for jets from light quarks or gluons in a simulated multijet sample. For this working point, the b jet identification efficiency is around 63% for b jets with $p_T > 20$ GeV in simulated $t\bar{t}$ events.

Muons are measured in the range $|\eta| < 2.4$, with detection planes made using three technologies: drift tubes, cathode strip chambers, and resistive plate chambers. Matching muons to tracks measured in the silicon tracker results in a relative p_T resolution, for muons with p_T up to 100 GeV, of 1% in the barrel and 3% in the endcaps. The p_T resolution in the barrel is better than 7% for muons with p_T up to 1 TeV [43].

The reconstructed vertex with the largest value of summed physics-object p_T^2 is taken to be the primary pp interaction vertex. The physics objects are the jets, clustered using the anti- k_T jet finding algorithm [39,40] with the tracks assigned to the vertex as inputs, and the associated missing transverse momentum, taken as the negative vector sum of the p_T of those jets. More details are given in Section 9.4.1 of Ref. [44].

3 Monte Carlo simulation

The MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO [45] v2.2.2 generator is used to simulate the following background processes: $W^\pm W^\pm$, $t\bar{t}V$, $V\gamma$, $WW\gamma$, $WZ\gamma$, $t\gamma$, $t\bar{t}\gamma$, VVV , VH , $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$, and tZq

($V = W, Z$). Except for the $W^\pm W^\pm$ process that is simulated at leading order (LO) [46–48] accuracy, the simulations are done at next-to-leading order (NLO) [49] accuracy in terms of perturbative quantum chromodynamics (QCD) and include up to one or two additional partons at the matrix element level. The simulations for WZ, ZZ, $t\bar{t}H$, and ggH are generated with POWHEG v2 [50–56] at NLO accuracy. Simulations of double parton scattering leading to the production of WW are done with PYTHIA v8.205 [57]. The parton showering and hadronization is simulated using PYTHIA v8.212 with the CUETP8M1 [58,59] tune for the underlying event. Double counting of additional partons between MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO and PYTHIA is removed with the appropriate technique for each simulation (MLM matching for LO [46,47], FxFx merging for NLO [49]). All samples include a simulation of the contributions from pileup that is matched to the data with a reweighting technique. The parton distribution functions (PDFs) are NNPDF3.0 LO [60] for LO and NNPDF3.0 NLO [60] for NLO samples, respectively. The GEANT4 [61] package is used to model the detector response for all background processes.

Monte Carlo (MC) simulated signal samples are produced for both simplified models defined in Sect. 1 using MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO at LO accuracy with NNPDF3.0 LO PDFs and PYTHIA for hadronization and showering. The detector simulation makes use of the CMS fast simulation package [62]. The mass scans range from 200 to 3000 GeV for the slepton mass, and from 100 to 2900 GeV for the LSP mass, with a 100 GeV spacing. For SM2, the mass of the chargino is calculated from the LSP and slepton mass as follows, using three different values of x (0.1, 0.5, 0.9):

$$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} = m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} + x (m_{\tilde{\nu}_\mu} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}). \quad (2)$$

For SM2, some points of the scans are omitted since the mass difference between the LSP and $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ would force the W boson to be off-shell. All signal studies and simulations are based on the MSSM-RpV-TriRpV model implementation in the SARAH [63–67] package. For the full model interpretation within the modified cMSSM, mass spectra and branching fractions have been calculated with the SPHENO [68,69] package.

4 Event selection

Events with the targeted signal signature will have exactly two muons with the same electric charge, at least two jets from light quarks (u, d), and no jets from b quarks. The following event requirements are designed to efficiently select signal-like events while rejecting SM background. Events are selected using triggers that require at least one muon

candidate with $p_T > 50$ GeV within $|\eta| < 2.4$. Typical trigger efficiencies for muons passing the identification criteria described below are around 90%.

Events are selected with exactly two well-identified muons within the acceptance of $|\eta| < 2.4$. The p_T of the leading (subleading) muon is required to be larger than 60 (20) GeV. In addition, the two muons are required to have the same electric charge and to have a dimuon invariant mass larger than 15 GeV. The muon reconstruction relies on the results of a global fit using measurements from the silicon tracker as well as the muon detectors. For muon candidates to be well identified, the global fit is required to be consistent with the measurements of the individual subsystems, and the relative uncertainty in the measured muon p_T is required to be smaller than 0.2.

To ensure that muon candidates originate from the primary vertex, the impact parameter, and the longitudinal displacement from the primary vertex of the corresponding point on the trajectory must be smaller than 0.5 and 1 mm, respectively. The ratio $|d_{3D}|/\sigma(d_{3D})$ is required to be smaller than 4, where d_{3D} is the three-dimensional impact parameter with respect to the primary vertex and $\sigma(d_{3D})$ its uncertainty from the track fit.

The isolation criterion for muons is based on a combination of three variables (I_{mini} , p_T^{ratio} , p_T^{rel}) and is designed to provide an efficient selection of muons from heavy-particle decays (e.g., W and Z bosons, and sparticles) especially in systems with a high Lorentz boost, where decay products and jets may overlap [70].

The mini isolation (I_{mini}) is defined as the scalar sum of the p_T of neutral hadrons, charged hadrons, and photons inside a cone of $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ (where ϕ is the azimuthal angle in radians) around the muon direction at the vertex, divided by the muon p_T . The cone size depends on the lepton p_T as

$$\Delta R(p_T(\ell)) = \frac{10 \text{ GeV}}{\min[\max(p_T(\ell), 50 \text{ GeV}), 200 \text{ GeV}]}. \quad (3)$$

The varying isolation cone helps to reduce the inefficiency from accidental overlap between the muon and jets in a busy event environment. The second isolation variable (p_T^{ratio}) is defined as the ratio of the muon p_T and the p_T of the closest jet within $\Delta R = 0.4$ around the muon. The p_T^{rel} variable is then defined as the transverse momentum of the muon with respect to that jet after subtracting the muon:

$$p_T^{\text{rel}} = \frac{|\vec{p}(\text{jet}) - \vec{p}(\ell)| \times |\vec{p}(\ell)|}{|\vec{p}(\text{jet}) - \vec{p}(\ell)|}. \quad (4)$$

If no jet is found within $\Delta R < 0.4$, p_T^{ratio} (p_T^{rel}) is set to 1 (0). Muons are classified as isolated if they fulfill the requirements

$$I_{\text{mini}} < 0.16 \text{ and } \left(p_{\text{T}}^{\text{ratio}} > 0.76 \text{ or } p_{\text{T}}^{\text{rel}} > 7.2 \text{ GeV} \right). \quad (5)$$

Events are required to have at least two jets with $p_{\text{T}} > 40 \text{ GeV}$ and $|\eta| < 2.4$. Jets that do not pass a set of quality criteria or are within $\Delta R < 0.4$ of a lepton are not included in this count. The quality criteria are designed to reject jets that are likely to originate from anomalous energy deposits [71]. Events with one or more b-tagged jets fulfilling the criteria listed above, but with a lowered p_{T} threshold of 30 GeV, are rejected. This requirement helps in reducing background from $\bar{t}t$ events as well as contributions from $t\bar{t}V$ and $t\bar{t}H$ production.

Several additional event vetoes are applied to reduce contributions from multilepton backgrounds. Events with additional muons, one or more electrons, or hadronically decaying tau leptons are rejected. For the muon veto a looser set of identification criteria is used. In addition, the p_{T} threshold is lowered to 5 GeV, and the isolation criterion is replaced by $I_{\text{mini}} < 0.4$. Electron identification is based on track quality, the shape of the energy deposits in the ECAL, and the ratio of energy deposits in the HCAL and ECAL. Electron candidates with missing hits in the innermost tracking layers or those assigned to a photon conversion are rejected. As an additional criterion, the mini isolation variable for electron candidates (similarly defined as for muons) is required to be smaller than 0.4. All electrons with $p_{\text{T}} > 10 \text{ GeV}$, $|\eta| < 2.5$, and fulfilling the criteria described above are used for the electron veto. Hadronically decaying τ candidates are reconstructed with the hadron-plus-strips algorithm and identified with a decay mode finding algorithm selecting one- and three-prong decays [72]. The candidates that fulfill the identification criteria, $p_{\text{T}} > 30 \text{ GeV}$, and $|\eta| < 2.3$, are used for the tau lepton veto.

To further separate signal and background, the SR is divided into ten bins indicated by SR1 to SR10 in the plane of $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$ and $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$, where $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$ is defined as the invariant mass of the two muons and all selected jets in the event, and $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ is the invariant mass of the subleading muon and the two leading jets. Events from signal processes would lead to a broad peak around the slepton mass along the $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$ axis. The expected shape of the signal in $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ depends on the involved masses. While SM1 yields a broad peak around the LSP mass in the $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ distribution for the vast majority of mass combinations, the peak for SM2 signals tends to be shifted to higher masses if one of the particles entering the $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ calculation is not from the LSP decay. The SR binning is chosen such that each signal will typically only contribute to a very small number of SR bins. The bins range from 0–500, 500–1000, 1000–1500 and $>1500 \text{ GeV}$ in both variables and are numbered in ascending order starting from the bins with an $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ of 0–500 GeV and increasing with $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$.

5 Background estimation

The sources of the SM background contributions can be divided into three classes: processes with two prompt muons, with at least one nonprompt muon, and with at least one muon from an internal photon conversion.

Processes with two prompt SS muons are estimated with MC simulation. The dominant contributions with prompt leptons come from WZ and SS $W^\pm W^\pm$ production. The contributions from WZ, $W^\pm W^\pm$, and ZZ are labeled as VV in the following. Other important backgrounds arise from $\bar{t}t$ in association with a W, Z, or Higgs boson ($\bar{t}t(V, H)$). All additional contributions with two prompt SS muons are labeled as “other” and include VVV, $\bar{t}t\bar{t}$, tZq , VH, ggH, and double parton scattering processes. The normalization of the WZ and $\bar{t}tZ$ processes is derived from a fit to data using the distribution of the number of b-tagged jets in a control region (CR) with three muons, at least two jets, and $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}} > 30 \text{ GeV}$. Two of the three muons are required to have opposite sign and invariant mass within 15 GeV around the Z boson mass. This results in scale factors to the simulation-based WZ and $\bar{t}tZ$ estimates of 1.22 ± 0.15 and 1.15 ± 0.50 , respectively. All additional prompt background estimates are based on simulation only. For WZ events with three prompt muons from the W and Z decay, an additional correction is applied to correct for potential differences in the third lepton veto efficiency between data and simulation.

Contributions from events with at least one nonprompt muon are estimated with the tight-to-loose ratio method. These events arise mostly from $\bar{t}t$ production, where one of the muons is produced in the decay of a bottom hadron. The tight-to-loose ratio method has two main steps. First, the ratio of the number of muons passing the tight working point to the number of muons passing the loose one (ϵ_{TL}) is measured in a CR that is dominated by SM events consisting of jets produced through the strong interaction (QCD multijet events). Here, tight muons are muons fulfilling all selection criteria from Sect. 4, while loose muons have relaxed constraints on the isolation. This measurement region contains events with exactly one loose muon candidate and at least two jets. To reduce the contamination of prompt leptons in the ϵ_{TL} measurement (mostly from $W \rightarrow \mu\nu$), the transverse mass of the lepton and $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{miss}}$ for events in the CR has to be smaller than 30 GeV. The remaining contribution from prompt leptons is estimated from simulation and subtracted from the numerator and denominator of ϵ_{TL} . Typical values for ϵ_{TL} are in the range of 0.05–0.07. In the second step, events from application regions are used as a proxy for the nonprompt contributions to the SR. Events in these regions have to pass the same requirements as SR events, with the exception that one or both muons fulfill only the loose, but not the tight, selection criteria. The contributions from events with two prompt muons are removed using simulations. For

each muon that is loose but not tight the event is weighted with $\epsilon_{\text{TL}}/(1 - \epsilon_{\text{TL}})$. The measurement of ϵ_{TL} is performed as a function of muon η and $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{corr}}$, which is defined as the muon p_{T} corrected according to the amount of energy in the isolation cone above the tight threshold. This is done to reduce the impact of differences between the measurement region (QCD multijet dominated) and the application regions ($t\bar{t}$ dominated). A detailed explanation of the tight-to-loose ratio method and the definition of $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{corr}}$ is given in Refs. [31, 70].

Another source of SM background is due to internal photon conversion, where a virtual photon converts into two muons. If the decay is very asymmetric, only one of the muons will pass the muon p_{T} threshold. Such conversions combined with the production of, e.g., a W boson can contribute to the SR. The performance of the conversion background simulation is validated in a three-lepton CR, where the invariant mass of the opposite-sign muon pair closest to the Z boson mass (m_{Z}) is smaller than 75 GeV and the invariant mass of the three muons fulfills $|m_{\mu\mu\mu} - m_{\text{Z}}| < 15 \text{ GeV}$.

Table 1 Sources of systematic uncertainties considered in this search and the range of yield variations in the signal regions. The background uncertainties are given as fractions of the total background yields in the signal regions. For the signal, the ranges covering the most relevant signal regions for each signal are given. The first three blocks affect the background predictions and list all experimental uncertainties, uncertainties for processes where the yield is obtained from data, and additional uncertainties for simulation-based backgrounds. In the last block, additional uncertainties for the signal prediction are shown

Source	Background (%)	Signal (%)
Integrated luminosity	1–2	2.5
Pileup	0–6	1–3
Trigger efficiency	1–2	1
Muon selection	3–6	6
b tagging	0–2	1–2
Jet energy scale and resolution	1–8	1–5
Nonprompt muon estimate	0–21	–
WZ normalization	1–3	–
$t\bar{t}Z$ normalization	0–3	–
$W^{\pm}W^{\pm}$ normalization	2–17	–
$t\bar{t}W$ normalization	0–3	–
$\gamma + X$, other, $t\bar{t}H$ normalization	1–14	–
Scale and PDF variations (shape)	0–9	0–1
$W^{\pm}W^{\pm}$ generator comparison	0–13	–
WZ third lepton veto	1–4	–
Stat. precision of simulations	3–32	–
Stat. precision signal efficiency	–	1–4
Initial state radiation	–	0–2
Muon fast simulation	–	4

Table 2 Expected and observed event yields in the signal regions. The uncertainties are the total systematic uncertainties in the expected yields. Also shown are the expected yields for two signal points normalized to the expected limits on the cross sections

SR	$m(\mu_2 j_1 j_2)$ (GeV)	$m(\mu_1 \mu_2 + \text{jets})$ (GeV)	Exp. SM (before fit)	Exp. SM (after fit)	Data	SM1 $m_{\tilde{\mu}} = 0.4 \text{ TeV}$ $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 0.2 \text{ TeV}$	SM2 ($x = 0.5$) $m_{\tilde{\nu}_{\mu}} = 1.4 \text{ TeV}$ $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 0.5 \text{ TeV}$
1	0–500	0–500	82.0 ± 19.0	96.9 ± 9.0	90	39.0 ± 4.6	< 0.01
2		500–1000	62.0 ± 11.0	74.3 ± 6.0	88	12.3 ± 1.7	0.37 ± 0.06
3		1000–1500	4.84 ± 0.99	5.53 ± 0.85	6	0.40 ± 0.11	1.48 ± 0.19
4		> 1500	0.41 ± 0.15	0.44 ± 0.17	0	0.04 ± 0.02	0.27 ± 0.04
5	500–1000	500–1000	19.6 ± 3.5	22.2 ± 2.5	21	1.29 ± 0.22	0.12 ± 0.02
6		1000–1500	14.5 ± 2.6	16.5 ± 2.0	17	0.84 ± 0.16	8.18 ± 0.94
7		> 1500	4.00 ± 1.30	3.57 ± 0.98	2	0.14 ± 0.05	2.54 ± 0.35
8	1000–1500	1000–1500	2.70 ± 0.56	2.99 ± 0.47	3	0.03 ± 0.02	0.08 ± 0.01
9		> 1500	4.39 ± 0.78	5.01 ± 0.63	10	0.14 ± 0.05	0.27 ± 0.04
10	> 1500	> 1500	3.54 ± 0.84	3.75 ± 0.72	1	0.08 ± 0.04	0.03 ± 0.01





Fig. 2 Expected (after fit) and observed event yields in the SR bins as defined in Table 2. The gray band shows the systematic uncertainty in the background yields. Also shown are the expected yields for two signal points normalized to their expected limit on the cross section. The vertical bars denote the Poisson confidence intervals calculated with the Garwood procedure, while the horizontal bars show the bin width

Fig. 3 Expected (after fit) and observed event yields in the $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$ and $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ distribution. Here, $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$ is defined as the invariant mass of both muons and all jets in the event, and $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ is the invariant mass of the subleading muon and the two leading jets. Also shown are the expected yields for two signal points normalized to their expected limit on the cross section. The vertical bars denote the Poisson confidence intervals calculated with the Garwood procedure, while the horizontal bars show the bin width



The resulting yields in data and simulation are consistent within the normalization uncertainty assigned to these processes (see Sect. 6). This background is referred to as $\gamma + X$ in the following.

The most important backgrounds in the first two SR bins are processes with nonprompt muons followed by VV production. With increasing $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ and $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$, the nonprompt background contributions become less relevant, making VV production the most important background for the other SR bins. Nonprompt and VV backgrounds account for 78% of the overall background. The next most important background is $t\bar{t}(V, H)$ production making up around 10% of the total background. The remaining 12% originates in equal amounts from $\gamma + X$ and the rare processes grouped as other backgrounds. Studies based on simulations indicate that the charge misidentification probability is negligible for muons passing the chosen identification criteria.

6 Systematic uncertainties

The expected yields and shapes of background and signal processes are affected by different systematic uncertainties. The uncertainties taken into account for this search are summarized in Table 1.

Experimental uncertainties include those related to the integrated luminosity, pileup modeling, trigger efficiencies, muon identification efficiencies, b tagging efficiencies, and jet energy measurement. These uncertainties are taken into account for both expected signal and background yields. For the integrated luminosity measurement an uncertainty of 2.5% is assigned [73]. The pileup simulation uses the total inelastic cross section, which is varied around its nominal

value to obtain an uncertainty estimate. This results in shifts of 0–8% in the expected yields for individual SR bins. The trigger, muon identification, and b tagging efficiencies are measured in data and in simulation. The differences between the two are corrected for by applying scale factors to the simulated events. Uncertainties in these measurements are propagated to the scale factors and used as systematic uncertainties. For the trigger efficiency measured in an independent data set this results in an uncertainty of 2% on the predicted simulation-based background yields. The muon identification uncertainty amounts to 3% per muon, which is based on tag-and-probe measurement techniques. For the b tag-

ging efficiency [42], the scale factors vary by 1–2% for b jets and around 10% for light jets. This leads to yield variations between 1 and 2% for simulation-based backgrounds. The jet energy measurement in simulation is corrected to match the energy scale as well as the resolution observed in data. Adding these two uncertainties in quadrature leads to variations between 1 and 8% of the background yields from simulation. For the nonprompt muon background estimate, several uncertainties are taken into account. The statistical uncertainty due to the finite number of events in the tight-to-loose ratio measurement region and the application region is propagated to the resulting event yields. In addition, uncer-




Fig. 4 Observed upper limits on cross sections at 95% CL. The upper left plot shows the limit in the $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ and $m_{\tilde{\mu}}$ mass plane for SM1, while the other three plots show the SM2 limits as a function of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ and $m_{\tilde{\nu}_\mu}$ for the three different scenarios with $x = 0.1$ (upper right), $x = 0.5$

(lower left) and $x = 0.9$ (lower right). The limit for a specific mass combination is depicted according to the color scale on the right-hand side of the figures

tainties due to prompt-lepton contamination in the tight-to-loose ratio measurement are considered. In total, this results in uncertainties between 32 and 56% for this background. The fit to obtain the normalization of WZ and $t\bar{t}Z$ processes, described in Sect. 5, results in scale factors with uncertainties of 15% (50%) for the WZ ($t\bar{t}Z$) process, which include both statistical and systematic components.

For the main backgrounds estimated from simulation (VV, $t\bar{t}V$), theoretical uncertainties are assessed by varying the QCD factorization and normalization scales by factors of 2 and 0.5, respectively. The asymmetric combinations, where one of the scales is multiplied by a factor of 2 while the other is multiplied by a factor of 0.5, are omitted [74, 75]. In addition, the different replicas of the NNPDF3.0 [60] set are used to estimate the uncertainties due to the proton PDFs. This results in normalization uncertainties of 21% (14%) for $W^\pm W^\pm$ ($t\bar{t}W$) production. For WZ and $t\bar{t}Z$ only the difference in shape is taken into account, since the normalization and its uncertainty are obtained from data. For the less important backgrounds ($\gamma + X$, $t\bar{t}H$, other), a flat 50% normalization uncertainty is used instead of the scale and PDF variations for each process group. The uncertainties in the shapes of VV and $t\bar{t}V$ processes due to scale and PDF variations are below 10%. Based on a comparison of samples from different generators (MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO, POWHEG), an additional uncertainty is assigned to the $W^\pm W^\pm$ background estimate, which amounts to 4–25%. The uncertainty in the third lepton veto efficiency correction for WZ is in the range of 7–24% and obtained from the uncertainty in the scale factors. For all processes, uncertainties due to limited sample sizes are taken into account. These are taken as uncorrelated among the individual SR bins and only affect the shape but not the overall expected yields. Their magnitude is within 3–32%.

The signal efficiencies and the corresponding uncertainties due to limited sample sizes are calculated with the Wilson score interval [76]. Typical values of the uncertainties for SR bins with at least 5% of the yields at a given signal point are within 1–4%. The MADGRAPH5_AMC@NLO modeling of initial-state radiation (ISR), which affects the total transverse momentum (p_T^{ISR}) of the slepton, is improved by reweighting the p_T^{ISR} distribution in signal events. The reweighting procedure is based on studies of the p_T of Z boson events in data [77]. The reweighting factors range between 1.18 at $p_T^{\text{ISR}} = 125$ GeV and 0.78 for $p_T^{\text{ISR}} > 600$ GeV. Their deviation from 1.0 is taken as systematic uncertainty in the reweighting.

Residual differences in the muon selection efficiencies between the CMS fast simulation package used for signal samples and the full detector simulation with GEANT4 are corrected by applying additional scale factors. The systematic uncertainties assigned to these scale factors are 2% per muon, resulting in a 4% uncertainty in the signal yield.

7 Results and interpretations

The expected and observed yields for the different SR bins are listed in Table 2 and shown in Fig. 2. The distributions of $m(\mu_1\mu_2 + \text{jets})$ and $m(\mu_2j_1j_2)$ are shown in Fig. 3. For the background estimates shown in these figures, all systematic uncertainties listed in Sect. 6 are included as nuisance parameters and constrained in a maximum likelihood fit of the expected background to the observed data assuming the background-only hypothesis. Table 2 shows the expected yields before and after the fit. No significant deviation is observed with respect to SM expectations. For all signal points, the highest observed deviation from the SM expectations is 2.0 standard deviations. This deviation is observed for the SM1 signal with $m_{\tilde{\mu}} = 0.7$ TeV and $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 0.3$ TeV, which has its main contribution in SR2.

In addition to the background and data yields, two benchmark signal points are shown. The first one is an SM1 signal with $m_{\tilde{\mu}} = 0.4$ TeV and a neutralino mass of $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = 0.2$ TeV. It is normalized to a cross section of 13.8 fb, which corresponds to a coupling of $\lambda'_{211} = 0.0016$ in the modified cMSSM for this process and the chosen masses. The second signal benchmark, from SM2, is normalized to a cross section of 1.20 fb, corresponding to $\lambda'_{211} = 0.0088$. The cor-




Fig. 5 Upper limits at 95% CL on the coupling λ'_{211} as a function of m_0 and $m_{1/2}$ for a modified cMSSM with λ'_{211} as additional RPV coupling. The color scale at the right side of the figure indicates the coupling limit value for specific parameter combinations. These limits are derived from the upper cross section limits of SM1. For four values of λ'_{211} (0.004, 0.01, 0.02, 0.03), the coupling limits are shown as black contour lines. The dashed lines show the parameters in the model that correspond to the mass of the lightest Higgs boson for three chosen values (124, 125, 126 GeV)

Table 3 Observed upper limits on cross sections at 95% CL for selected SM2 points. The corresponding limits on λ'_{211} for the modified cMSSM with λ'_{211} as additional coupling are shown as well

m_0 (GeV)	$m_{1/2}$ (GeV)	$m_{\tilde{\nu}_\mu}$ (GeV)	$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ (GeV)	x	Cross section limit (fb)	λ'_{211} limit
890	250	900	100	0.1	8.7	0.0085
990	250	1000	100	0.1	5.0	0.0081
1880	480	1900	200	0.1	0.32	0.0093
1980	480	2000	200	0.1	0.31	0.011
2670	700	2700	300	0.1	0.27	0.026
2770	700	2800	300	0.1	0.28	0.031
1180	1160	1400	500	0.5	1.08	0.0084
1860	1820	2200	800	0.5	1.05	0.028
2280	2250	2700	1000	0.5	0.84	0.048
2550	2470	3000	1100	0.5	0.57	0.058

responding slepton mass is 1.4 TeV, the neutralino mass is 0.5 TeV, and $x = 0.5$. The combined acceptance times efficiency is 11% and 31% for the first and second benchmark signal points, respectively.

The results are interpreted in terms of the simplified models introduced in Sect. 1. Upper limits on cross sections are set at 95% confidence level (CL) using the CL_s criterion [78–80] in the asymptotic approximation [81] with the frequentist profile likelihood ratio presented in Ref. [80]. The uncertainties listed in Sect. 6 are included as nuisance parameters assuming log-normal distributions and are profiled in the limit setting. The observed cross section upper limits are shown in Fig. 4 as a function of the sparticle masses of each signal point.

The upper bounds on cross sections are translated into coupling limits of the full cMSSM-like model with an additional RPV coupling λ'_{211} as explained in Sect. 1. For this benchmark model, the cMSSM parameters are set to $\tan \beta = 20$, $\mu > 0$, and $A_0 = 0$. Here, $\tan \beta$ is the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of the neutral components of the two Higgs doublets, μ the SUSY Higgsino mass parameter, and A_0 the universal trilinear coupling. The coupling limits are derived for each mass combination of $\tilde{\mu}_L$ and $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ in SM1 where the mass combination corresponds to a valid cMSSM point. The full model cross section times the branching fraction for the decay according to SM1 is equal to the observed SM1 cross section limit at a specific value of λ'_{211} . This value corresponds to the expected upper bound on the coupling. Full model cross sections have been calculated with MADGRAPH5_aMC@NLO for a coupling value of $\lambda'_{211} = 0.01$. All λ'_{211} coupling values are given at the unification scale. Cross sections for different values of the coupling are extrapolated assuming a scaling of the cross section with λ'^2_{211} . Signal points where this assumption is not valid are discarded, e.g., for values where the branching fraction of the $\tilde{\mu}_L$ or $\tilde{\nu}_\mu$ into quarks becomes relevant. The resulting λ'_{211} limits based on SM1 are shown in Fig. 5 as a function of m_0 and $m_{1/2}$, denoting the universal scalar and gaugino masses in

the cMSSM, respectively. For the cMSSM-like model, no constraint on the Higgs boson mass was imposed. For three chosen values, the parameters corresponding to the mass of the lightest Higgs boson in the model calculated with a top quark mass of 172.5 GeV are shown as dashed lines. Using a similar method, coupling limits are derived for the SM2 points where the three involved masses correspond to a valid cMSSM point. These results are listed in Table 3. For the scan with $x = 0.9$, no point matches the criteria above.

8 Summary

A search for resonant production of second-generation sleptons ($\tilde{\mu}_L$, $\tilde{\nu}_\mu$) using 35.9 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collisions recorded in 2016 with the CMS detector has been presented. The search targets resonant slepton production via the R -parity violating coupling λ'_{211} to quarks in final states with two same-sign muons and at least two jets. No significant excess over the background expectation is observed. Upper limits on cross sections are set in the context of two simplified models covering the dominant production mechanisms in a modified constrained minimal supersymmetric model (cMSSM) with λ'_{211} as an additional coupling. These limits, ranging from 0.24 to 730 fb, are translated into limits on the coupling λ'_{211} in the modified cMSSM, and represent the most stringent limits on this particular model of R -parity violating supersymmetry.

Acknowledgements We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centres and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria);

CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); NKFI (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); MES (Latvia); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MOS (Montenegro); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS, RFBR, and NRC KI (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI, CPAN, PCTI, and FEDER (Spain); MOSTR (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA). Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie programme and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract No. 675440 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the "Excellence of Science - EOS" - be.h project n. 30820817; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Lendület ("Momentum") Programme and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFI research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850 and 125105 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS programme of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus programme of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and the Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias; the Thalís and Arístia programmes cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (USA).

Data Availability Statement This manuscript has no associated data or the data will not be deposited. [Authors' comment: Release and preservation of data used by the CMS Collaboration as the basis for publications is guided by the CMS policy as written in its document "CMS data preservation, re-use and open access policy" (<https://cms-docdb.cern.ch/cgi-bin/PublicDocDB/RetrieveFile?docid=6032&filename=CMSDataPolicyV1.2.pdf&version=2>).]

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

Funded by SCOAP³.

References

1. P. Ramond, Dual theory for free fermions. *Phys. Rev. D* **3**, 2415 (1971). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.3.2415>
2. Y.A. Gol'fand, E.P. Likhtman, Extension of the algebra of Poincaré group generators and violation of P invariance. *JETP Lett.* **13**, 323 (1971)
3. A. Neveu, J.H. Schwarz, Factorizable dual model of pions. *Nucl. Phys. B* **31**, 86 (1971). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(71\)90448-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(71)90448-2)
4. D.V. Volkov, V.P. Akulov, Possible universal neutrino interaction. *JETP Lett.* **16**, 438 (1972)
5. J. Wess, B. Zumino, A Lagrangian model invariant under supergauge transformations. *Phys. Lett. B* **49**, 52 (1974). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(74\)90578-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(74)90578-4)
6. J. Wess, B. Zumino, Supergauge transformations in four-dimensions. *Nucl. Phys. B* **70**, 39 (1974). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(74\)90355-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(74)90355-1)
7. P. Fayet, Supergauge invariant extension of the Higgs mechanism and a model for the electron and its neutrino. *Nucl. Phys. B* **90**, 104 (1975). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(75\)90636-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(75)90636-7)
8. G.R. Farrar, P. Fayet, Phenomenology of the production, decay, and detection of new hadronic states associated with supersymmetry. *Phys. Lett. B* **76**, 575 (1978). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(78\)90858-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(78)90858-4)
9. A.J. Buras, J. Ellis, M.K. Gaillard, D.V. Nanopoulos, Aspects of the grand unification of strong, weak and electromagnetic interactions. *Nucl. Phys. B* **135**, 66 (1978). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(78\)90214-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(78)90214-6)
10. S. Weinberg, Supersymmetry at ordinary energies. Masses and conservation laws. *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 287 (1982). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.26.287>
11. H.P. Nilles, Supersymmetry, supergravity and particle physics. *Phys. Rept.* **110**, 1 (1984). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573\(84\)90008-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(84)90008-5)
12. H.E. Haber, G.L. Kane, The search for supersymmetry: Probing physics beyond the standard model. *Phys. Rept.* **117**, 75 (1985). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573\(85\)90051-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(85)90051-1)
13. S.P. Martin, A supersymmetry primer. *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.* **21**, 1 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814307505_0001. [arXiv:hep-ph/9709356](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9709356)
14. L.E. Ibáñez, G. Ross, Discrete gauge symmetries and the origin of baryon and lepton number conservation in supersymmetric versions of the standard model. *Nucl. Phys. B* **368**, 3 (1992). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(92\)90195-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(92)90195-H)
15. H.K. Dreiner, C. Luhn, M. Thormeier, What is the discrete gauge symmetry of the MSSM? *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 075007 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.73.075007>. [arXiv:hep-ph/0512163](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0512163)
16. R. Barbier et al., R-parity violating supersymmetry. *Phys. Rept.* **420**, 1 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2005.08.006>. [arXiv:hep-ph/0406039](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0406039)
17. S. Dimopoulos, L.J. Hall, Lepton- and baryon-number violating collider signatures from supersymmetry. *Phys. Lett. B* **207**, 210 (1988). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(88\)91418-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(88)91418-9)
18. S. Dimopoulos et al., Cross sections for lepton- and baryon-number-violating processes from supersymmetry at $p\bar{p}$ colliders. *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 2099 (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.41.2099>
19. H. Dreiner, G.G. Ross, R-parity violation at hadron colliders. *Nucl. Phys. B* **365**, 597 (1991). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(91\)90443-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(91)90443-2)
20. H.K. Dreiner, P. Richardson, M. Seymour, Resonant slepton production in hadron-hadron collisions. *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 055008 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.63.055008>. [arXiv:hep-ph/0007228](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0007228)

21. F. Déliot, G. Moreau, C. Royon, Single superpartner production at Tevatron Run II. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **19**, 155 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s100520100568>. arXiv:hep-ph/0007288
22. H.K. Dreiner, S. Grab, M. Kramer, M.K. Trenkel, Supersymmetric NLO QCD corrections to resonant slepton production and signals at the Fermilab Tevatron and the CERN LHC. *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 035003 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.75.035003>. arXiv:hep-ph/0611195
23. C. Kilic, S. Thomas, Signatures of resonant superpartner production with charged-current decays. *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 055012 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.84.055012>. arXiv:1104.1002
24. B.C. Allanach, S. Biswas, S. Mondal, M. Mitra, Resonant slepton production yields CMS $eejj$ and $e\tau jj$ excesses. *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 015011 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.015011>. arXiv:1410.5947
25. B.C. Allanach, P.S.B. Dev, S.A. Renner, K. Sakurai, 750 GeV diphoton excess explained by a resonant sneutrino in R -parity violating supersymmetry. *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 115022 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.115022>. arXiv:1512.07645
26. D0 Collaboration, Search for resonant second generation slepton production at the Tevatron. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 111801 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.111801>. arXiv:hep-ex/0605010
27. H.K. Dreiner, T. Stefaniak, Bounds on R -parity violation from resonant slepton production at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 055010 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.86.055010>. arXiv:1201.5014
28. CMS Collaboration, Search for supersymmetric partners of electrons and muons in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV (2018). arXiv:1806.05264 (Submitted to *Phys. Lett. B*)
29. ATLAS Collaboration, Search for electroweak production of supersymmetric particles in final states with two or three leptons at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector (2018). arXiv:1803.02762 (Submitted to *Eur. Phys. J. C*)
30. ATLAS Collaboration, Search for supersymmetry in final states with two same-sign or three leptons and jets using 36 fb⁻¹ of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collision data with the ATLAS detector. *JHEP* **09**, 084 (2017). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09\(2017\)084](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2017)084). arXiv:1706.03731
31. CMS Collaboration, Search for physics beyond the standard model in events with two leptons of same sign, missing transverse momentum, and jets in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 578 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5079-z>. arXiv:1704.07323
32. D. Dercks et al., R -parity violation at the LHC. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 856 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5414-4>. arXiv:1706.09418
33. G.L. Kane, C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski, J.D. Wells, Study of constrained minimal supersymmetry. *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 6173 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.49.6173>. arXiv:hep-ph/9312272
34. D. Alves et al., Simplified models for LHC new physics searches. *J. Phys. G* **39**, 105005 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/39/10/105005>. arXiv:1105.2838
35. CMS Collaboration, Interpretation of searches for supersymmetry with simplified models. *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 052017 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.052017>. arXiv:1301.2175
36. CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC. *JINST* **3**, S08004 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>
37. CMS Collaboration, The CMS trigger system. *JINST* **12**, P01020 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020>. arXiv:1609.02366
38. CMS Collaboration, Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector. *JINST* **12**, P10003 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/10/P10003>. arXiv:1706.04965
39. M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm. *JHEP* **04**, 063 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063>. arXiv:0802.1189
40. M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, FastJet user manual. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72**, 1896 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2>. arXiv:1111.6097
41. CMS Collaboration, Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV. *JINST* **12**, P02014 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014>. arXiv:1607.03663
42. CMS Collaboration, Identification of heavy-flavour jets with the CMS detector in pp collisions at 13 TeV. *JINST* **13**, P05011 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/13/05/P05011>. arXiv:1712.07158
43. CMS Collaboration, Performance of the CMS muon detector and muon reconstruction with proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JINST* **13**, P06015 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/13/06/P06015>. arXiv:1804.04528
44. CMS Collaboration, Technical proposal for the Phase-II upgrade of the Compact Muon Solenoid, CMS Technical proposal CERN-LHCC-2015-010, CMS-TDR-15-02, CERN (2015). <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2020886>
45. J. Alwall et al., The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations. *JHEP* **07**, 079 (2014). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2014\)079](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2014)079). arXiv:1405.0301
46. J. Alwall et al., Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **53**, 473 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5>. arXiv:0706.2569
47. J. Alwall, S. de Visscher, F. Maltoni, QCD radiation in the production of heavy colored particles at the LHC. *JHEP* **02**, 017 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/02/017>. arXiv:0810.5350
48. A. Kalogeropoulos, J. Alwall, The SysCalc code: A tool to derive theoretical systematic uncertainties (2018). arXiv:1801.08401
49. R. Frederix, S. Frixione, Merging meets matching in MC@NLO. *JHEP* **12**, 061 (2012). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12\(2012\)061](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP12(2012)061). arXiv:1209.6215
50. P. Nason, A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms. *JHEP* **11**, 040 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040>. arXiv:hep-ph/0409146
51. S. Frixione, P. Nason, C. Oleari, Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method. *JHEP* **11**, 070 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070>. arXiv:0709.2092
52. S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, E. Re, A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX. *JHEP* **06**, 043 (2010). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06\(2010\)043](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP06(2010)043). arXiv:1002.2581
53. T. Melia, P. Nason, R. Rontsch, G. Zanderighi, W^+W^- , WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG BOX. *JHEP* **11**, 078 (2011). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11\(2011\)078](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP11(2011)078). arXiv:1107.5051
54. P. Nason, G. Zanderighi, W^+W^- , WZ and ZZ production in the POWHEG-BOX-V2. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2702 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2702-5>. arXiv:1311.1365
55. H.B. Hartanto, B. Jager, L. Reina, D. Wackerroth, Higgs boson production in association with top quarks in the POWHEG BOX. *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 094003 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.094003>. arXiv:1501.04498
56. E. Bagnaschi, G. Degrandi, P. Slavich, A. Vicini, Higgs production via gluon fusion in the POWHEG approach in the SM and in the MSSM. *JHEP* **02**, 088 (2012). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02\(2012\)088](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP02(2012)088). arXiv:1111.2854

57. T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P.Z. Skands, A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178**, 852 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2008.01.036>. arXiv:0710.3820
58. P. Skands, S. Carrazza, J. Rojo, Tuning PYTHIA 8.1: the Monash 2013 tune. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**(2014), 3024 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3024-y>. arXiv:1404.5630
59. CMS Collaboration, Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, 155 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x>. arXiv:1512.00815
60. NNPDF Collaboration, Parton distributions for the LHC Run II. *JHEP* **04**, 040 (2015). [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04\(2015\)040](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP04(2015)040). arXiv:1410.8849
61. GEANT4 Collaboration, GEANT4—a simulation toolkit. *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506**, 250 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8)
62. S. Abdullin et al., The fast simulation of the CMS detector at LHC. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **331**, 032049 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/331/3/032049>
63. F. Staub, SARAH 4: A tool for (not only SUSY) model builders. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **185**, 1773 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2014.02.018>. arXiv:1309.7223
64. F. Staub, T. Ohl, W. Porod, C. Speckner, A tool box for implementing supersymmetric models. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**, 2165 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2012.04.013>. arXiv:1109.5147
65. M.D. Goodsell, K. Nickel, F. Staub, Two-loop Higgs mass calculations in supersymmetric models beyond the MSSM with SARAH and SPheno. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 32 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3247-y>. arXiv:1411.0675
66. M.D. Goodsell, F. Staub, The Higgs mass in the CP violating MSSM, NMSSM, and beyond. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 46 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4495-9>. arXiv:1604.05335
67. F. Staub, W. Porod, Improved predictions for intermediate and heavy supersymmetry in the MSSM and beyond. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 338 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4893-7>. arXiv:1703.03267
68. W. Porod, SPheno, a program for calculating supersymmetric spectra, SUSY particle decays and SUSY particle production at e^+e^- colliders. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **153**, 275 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-4655\(03\)00222-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-4655(03)00222-4). arXiv:hep-ph/0301101
69. W. Porod, F. Staub, SPheno 3.1: Extensions including flavour, CP-phases and models beyond the MSSM. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**, 2458 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2012.05.021>. arXiv:1104.1573
70. CMS Collaboration, Search for new physics in same-sign dilepton events in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, 439 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4261-z>. arXiv:1605.03171
71. CMS Collaboration, Performance of the CMS missing transverse momentum reconstruction in pp data at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. *JINST* **10**, P02006 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/02/P02006>. arXiv:1411.0511
72. CMS Collaboration, Reconstruction and identification of τ lepton decays to hadrons and ν_τ at CMS. *JINST* **11**, P01019 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/11/01/P01019>. arXiv:1510.07488
73. CMS Collaboration, CMS luminosity measurements for the 2016 data taking period, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-17-001 (2017). <http://cds.cern.ch/record/2257069>
74. M. Cacciari et al., The $t\bar{t}$ cross-section at 1.8 TeV and 1.96 TeV: A study of the systematics due to parton densities and scale dependence. *JHEP* **04**, 068 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/04/068>. arXiv:hep-ph/0303085
75. S. Catani, D. de Florian, M. Grazzini, P. Nason, Soft gluon resummation for Higgs boson production at hadron colliders. *JHEP* **07**, 028 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2003/07/028>. arXiv:hep-ph/0306211
76. R.D. Cousins, K.E. Hymes, J. Tucker, Frequentist evaluation of intervals estimated for a binomial parameter and for the ratio of Poisson means. *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* **612**, 388 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nima.2009.10.156>. arXiv:0905.3831
77. CMS Collaboration, Search for top-squark pair production in the single-lepton final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2677 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2677-2>. arXiv:1308.1586
78. T. Junk, Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics. *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* **434**, 435 (1999). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(99\)00498-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2). arXiv:hep-ex/9902006
79. A.L. Read, Presentation of search results: The CL_s technique. *J. Phys. G* **28**, 2693 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/28/10/313>
80. ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, and LHC Higgs Combination Group, Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011, Technical Report CMS-NOTE-2011-005, ATLAS-PUB-2011-11 (2011). <http://cds.cern.ch/record/1379837>
81. G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, O. Vitells, Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71**, 1554 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0>. arXiv:1007.1727 (Erratum: 10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2501-z)

CMS Collaboration**Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia**

A. M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Vienna, Austria

W. Adam, F. Ambrogio, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, M. Flechl, R. Frühwirth¹, V. M. Ghete, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, N. Rad, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöffbeck, M. Spanring, D. Spitzbart, A. Taurok, W. Waltenberger, J. Wittmann, C.-E. Wulz¹, M. Zarucki

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

V. Chekhovsky, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

E. A. De Wolf, D. Di Croce, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, M. Pieters, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, I. De Bruyn, J. De Clercq, K. Deroover, G. Flouris, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, Q. Python, K. Skovpen, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

D. Beghin, B. Bilin, H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, B. Dorney, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, A. K. Kalsi, T. Lenzi, J. Luetic, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, Q. Wang

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov², D. Poyraz, C. Roskas, D. Trocino, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, B. Vermassen, M. Vit, N. Zaganidis

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

H. Bakhshiansohi, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, A. Giammanco, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, K. Piotrkowski, A. Saggio, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz, J. Zobec

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

F. L. Alves, G. A. Alves, M. Correa Martins Junior, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M. E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato³, E. Coelho, E. M. Da Costa, G. G. Da Silveira⁴, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W. L. Prado Da Silva, L. J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, E. J. Tonelli Manganote³, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade Estadual Paulista^a, Universidade Federal do ABC^b, São Paulo, Brazil

S. Ahuja^a, C. A. Bernardes^a, L. Calligaris^a, T. R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E. M. Gregores^b, P. G. Mercadante^b, S. F. Novaes^a, SandraS. Padula^a

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, A. Marinov, M. Misheva, M. Rodozov, M. Shopova, G. Sultanov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

Beihang University, Beijing, ChinaW. Fang⁵, X. Gao⁵, L. Yuan**Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China**

M. Ahmad, J. G. Bian, G. M. Chen, H. S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen, C. H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, S. M. Shaheen⁶, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, Z. Wang, E. Yazgan, H. Zhang, S. Zhang⁶, J. Zhao

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

Y. Ban, G. Chen, A. Levin, J. Li, L. Li, Q. Li, Y. Mao, S. J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu

Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Y. Wang

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C. A. Carrillo Montoya, L. F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, C. F. González Hernández, M. A. Segura Delgado

Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, University of Split, Split, Croatia

B. Courbon, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac

Faculty of Science, University of Split, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, CroatiaV. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, A. Starodumov⁷, T. Susa**University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus**

M. W. Ather, A. Attikis, M. Kolosova, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P. A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski

Charles University, Prague, Czech RepublicM. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸**Escuela Politécnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador**

E. Ayala

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, EgyptA. Ellithi Kamel⁹, S. Khalil¹⁰, E. Salama^{11,12}**National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia**

S. Bhowmik, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira, R. K. Dewanjee, K. Ehataht, M. Kadastik, M. Raidal, C. Veelken

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, H. Kirschenmann, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

J. Havukainen, J. K. Heikkilä, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, T. Mäenpää, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

T. Tuuva

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, J. L. Faure, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup, E. Locci, J. Malcles, G. Negro, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Ö. Sahin, M. Titov

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole polytechnique, CNRS/IN2P3, Université Paris-Saclay, Palaiseau, FranceA. Abdulsalam¹³, C. Amendola, I. Antropov, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, A. Lobanov, J. Martin Blanco, C. Martin Perez, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, J. Rembser, R. Salerno, J. B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A. G. Stahl Leiton, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche**Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France**J.-L. Agram¹⁴, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, E. C. Chabert, V. Cherepanov, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁴, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁴, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, M. Jansová, A.-C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove

Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France

S. Gadrat

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, L. Finco, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I. B. Laktineh, H. Lattaud, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁵, V. Sordini, G. Touquet, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

A. Khvedelidze⁸

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze⁸

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

C. Autermann, L. Feld, M. K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, M. P. Rauch, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, M. Teroerde, B. Wittmer

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

A. Albert, D. Duchardt, M. Erdmann, S. Erdweg, T. Esch, R. Fischer, S. Ghosh, A. Güth, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, L. Mastrolorenzo, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, A. Schmidt, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

G. Flügge, O. Hlushchenko, T. Kress, A. Künsken, T. Müller, A. Nehr Korn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, D. Roy, H. Sert, A. Stahl¹⁶

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, I. Babounikau, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A. Bermúdez Martínez, D. Bertsche, A. A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁷, V. Botta, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M. M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos, D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁸, A. Geiser, A. Grohsjean, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, J. Hauk, H. Jung, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann¹⁹, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A. B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, V. Myronenko, S. K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, M. Savitskyi, P. Saxena, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, H. Tholen, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, G. P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, V. Blobel, T. Dreyer, A. Ebrahimi, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, P. Gunnellini, J. Haller, A. Hinzmann, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, D. Marconi, J. Multhaupt, M. Niedziela, C.E.N. Niemeyer, D. Nowatschin, A. Perieanu, A. Reimers, O. Rieger, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F. M. Stober, M. Stöver, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald, I. Zoi

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, M. Baselga, S. Baur, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, K. El Morabit, N. Faltermann, B. Freund, M. Giffels, M. A. Harrendorf, F. Hartmann¹⁶, S. M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁵, S. Kudella, S. Mitra, M. U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, H. J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki, I. Topsis-Giotis

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

G. Karathanasis, S. Kesisoglou, P. Kontaxakis, A. Panagiotou, I. Papavergou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi, K. Vellidis

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Giannios, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas, J. Strologas, F. A. Triantis, D. Tsitsonis

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, HungaryM. Bartók²⁰, M. Csanad, N. Filipovic, P. Major, M. I. Nagy, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G. I. Veres**Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary**G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²¹, Á. Hunyadi, F. Sikler, T. Á. Vámi, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†]**Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary**N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²², A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi**Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary**

P. Raics, Z. L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India

S. Choudhury, J. R. Komaragiri, P. C. Tiwari

National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar, IndiaS. Bahinipati²³, C. Kar, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²⁴, D. K. Sahoo²³, S. K. Swain**Panjab University, Chandigarh, India**

S. Bansal, S. B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, R. Chawla, N. Dhingra, R. Gupta, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur, P. Kumari, M. Lohan, A. Mehta, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J. B. Singh, A. K. Viridi, G. Walia

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

A. Bhardwaj, B. C. Choudhary, R. B. Garg, M. Gola, S. Keshri, Ashok Kumar, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, P. Priyanka, K. Ranjan, Aashaq Shah, R. Sharma

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, IndiaR. Bhardwaj²⁵, M. Bharti²⁵, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep²⁵, D. Bhowmik, S. Dey, S. Dutt²⁵, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P. K. Rout, A. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, G. Saha, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh²⁵, S. Thakur²⁵**Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India**

P. K. Behera

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, P. K. Netrakanti, L. M. Pant, P. Shukla

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, M. A. Bhat, S. Dugad, G. B. Mohanty, N. Sur, B. Sutar, RavindraKumar Verma

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, IndiaS. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁶, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, T. Sarkar²⁶**Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India**

S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, IranS. Chenarani²⁷, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S. M. Etesami²⁷, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh²⁸, M. Zeinali**University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland**

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

INFN Sezione di Bari^a, Università di Bari^b, Politecnico di Bari^c, Bari, Italy

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, F. Errico^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, M. Ince^{a,b}, S. Lezki^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^a, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^a, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a, G. Zito^a

INFN Sezione di Bologna^a, Università di Bologna^b, Bologna, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borghoni^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F. R. Cavallo^a, S. S. Chhibra^{a,b}, C. Ciocca^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G. M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, E. Fontanesi, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Lo Meo^a, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F. L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b,16}, A. M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G. P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

INFN Sezione di Catania^a, Università di Catania^b, Catania, Italy

S. Albergo^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Firenze^a, Università di Firenze^b, Firenze, Italy

G. Barbagli^a, K. Chatterjee^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, G. Latino, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, L. Russo^{a,29}, G. Sguazzoni^a, D. Strom^a, L. Viliani^a

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo

INFN Sezione di Genova^a, Università di Genova^b, Genoa, Italy

F. Ferro^a, F. Ravera^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca^a, Università di Milano-Bicocca^b, Milan, Italy

A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^b, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,16}, S. Di Guida^{a,d,16}, M. E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M. Malberti^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, A. Massironi^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, F. Monti, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, D. Zuolo^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Napoli^a, Università di Napoli 'Federico II'^b, Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata^c, Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi^d, Rome, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. De Iorio^{a,b}, A. Di Crescenzo^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, G. Galati^a, A. O. M. Iorio^{a,b}, W. A. Khan^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,16}, P. Paolucci^{a,16}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, E. Voevodina^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Padova^a, Università di Padova^b, Padova, Italy, Università di Trento^c, Trento, Italy

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, A. Boletti^{a,b}, A. Bragagnolo, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, M. Dall'Osso^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, S. Y. Hoh, S. Lacaprara^a, P. Lujan, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A. T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, A. Tiko, E. Torassa^a, S. Ventura^a, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Pavia^a, Università di Pavia^b, Pavia, Italy

A. Braghieri^a, A. Magnani^a, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S. P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, M. Ressegotti^{a,b}, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Salvini^a, I. Vai^{a,b}, P. Vitulo^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Perugia^a, Università di Perugia^b, Perugia, Italy

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G. M. Bilei^a, C. Cecchi^{a,b}, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, E. Manoni^a, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b}, D. Spiga^a

INFN Sezione di Pisa^a, Università di Pisa^b, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa^c, Pisa, Italy

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a, L. Borrello, R. Castaldi^a, M. A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell'Orso^a, G. Fedi^a, F. Fiori^{a,c}, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a, M. T. Grippo^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, G. Rolandi³⁰, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P. G. Verdini^a

INFN Sezione di Roma^a, Sapienza Università di Roma^b, Rome, Italy

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, D. Del Re^{a,b}, E. Di Marco^{a,b}, M. Diemoz^a, S. Gelli^{a,b}, E. Longo^{a,b}, B. Marzocchi^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, F. Pandolfi^a, R. Paramatti^{a,b}, F. Preiato^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Torino^a, Università di Torino^b, Torino, Italy, Università del Piemonte Orientale^c, Novara, Italy

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, N. Bartosik^a, R. Bellan^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, F. Cenna^{a,b}, S. Cometti^a, M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, B. Kiani^{a,b}, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, E. Monteil^{a,b}, M. Monteno^a, M. M. Obertino^{a,b}, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, G. L. Pinna Angioni^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, K. Shchelina^{a,b}, V. Sola^a, A. Solano^{a,b}, D. Soldi^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a

INFN Sezione di Trieste^a, Università di Trieste^b, Trieste, Italy

S. Belforte^a, V. Candelise^{a,b}, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^a, A. Da Rold^{a,b}, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, F. Vazzoler^{a,b}, A. Zanetti^a

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

D. H. Kim, G. N. Kim, M. S. Kim, J. Lee, S. Lee, S. W. Lee, C. S. Moon, Y. D. Oh, S. I. Pak, S. Sekmen, D. C. Son, Y. C. Yang

Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Chonnam National University, Kwangju, Korea

H. Kim, D. H. Moon, G. Oh

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

B. Francois, J. Goh³¹, T. J. Kim

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, S. Ha, B. Hong, Y. Jo, K. Lee, K. S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim, S. K. Park, Y. Roh

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea

H. S. Kim

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

J. Almond, J. Kim, J. S. Kim, H. Lee, K. Lee, K. Nam, S. B. Oh, B. C. Radburn-Smith, S. h. Seo, U. K. Yang, H. D. Yoo, G. B. Yu

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

D. Jeon, H. Kim, J. H. Kim, J. S. H. Lee, I. C. Park

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

I. Ahmed, Z. A. Ibrahim, M. A. B. Md Ali³², F. Mohamad Idris³³, W. A. T. Wan Abdullah, M. N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

J. F. Benitez, A. Castaneda Hernandez, J. A. Murillo Quijada

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, M. C. Duran-Osuna, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁴, R. Lopez-Fernandez, J. Mejia Guisao, R. I. Rabadan-Trejo, M. Ramirez-Garcia, G. Ramirez-Sanchez, R. Reyes-Almanza, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H. A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

A. Morelos Pineda

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

S. Bheesette, P. H. Butler

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, M. I. Asghar, Q. Hassan, H. R. Hoorani, A. Saddique, M. A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, M. Szleper, P. Traczyk, P. Zalewski

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, PolandK. Bunkowski, A. Byszek³⁵, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, A. Pyskir, M. Walczak**Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisbon, Portugal**

M. Araujo, P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, J. Seixas, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, J. Varela

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, RussiaS. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavine, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{36,37}, P. Moisezenz, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin**Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia**V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁸, E. Kuznetsova³⁹, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, S. Vavilov, A. Vorobyev**Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia**

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, A. Stepenov, V. Stolin, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

T. Aushev

National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, RussiaM. Chadeeva⁴⁰, P. Parygin, D. Philippov, S. Polikarpov⁴⁰, E. Popova, V. Rusinov**P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia**V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin³⁷, M. Kirakosyan, S. V. Rusakov, A. Terkulov**Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia**A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, M. Dubinin⁴¹, L. Dudko, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev**Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia**A. Barnyakov⁴², V. Blinov⁴², T. Dimova⁴², L. Kardapoltsev⁴², Y. Skovpen⁴²**Institute for High Energy Physics of National Research Centre 'Kurchatov Institute', Protvino, Russia**

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, A. Godizov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, P. Mandrik, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, S. Slabospitskii, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia

A. Babaev, S. Baidali, V. Okhotnikov

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, SerbiaP. Adzic⁴³, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic

Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain

J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, J. A. Brochero Cifuentes, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J. P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M. C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J. M. Hernandez, M. I. Josa, D. Moran, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M. S. Soares, A. Triossi

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, J. F. de Trocóniz

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J. R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, V. Rodríguez Bouza, S. Sanchez Cruz, P. Vischia, J. M. Vizán García

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain

I. J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P. J. Fernández Manteca, A. García Alonso, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, C. Prieels, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

Department of Physics, University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka

N. Wickramage

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A. H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, C. Botta, E. Brondolin, T. Camporesi, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, Y. Chen, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, N. Daci, V. Daponte, A. David, A. De Roeck, N. Deelen, M. Dobson, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, F. Fallavollita⁴⁴, D. Fasanella, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, A. Gilbert, K. Gill, F. Glege, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, C. Heidegger, V. Innocente, A. Jafari, P. Janot, O. Karacheban¹⁹, J. Kieseler, A. Kornmayer, M. Krammer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, F. Meijers, J. A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic⁴⁵, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, S. Nourbakhsh, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, F. Pantaleo¹⁶, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F. M. Pitters, D. Rabadý, A. Racz, T. Reis, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁶, A. Stakia, J. Stegmann, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Tsiros, V. Veckalns⁴⁷, M. Verzetti, W. D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

L. Caminada⁴⁸, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H. C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe, S. A. Wiederkehr

ETH Zurich - Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics (IPA), Zurich, Switzerland

M. Backhaus, L. Bäni, P. Berger, N. Chernyavskaya, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer, T. A. Gómez Espinosa, C. Grab, D. Hits, T. Klijsma, W. Lustermann, R. A. Manzoni, M. Marionneau, M. T. Meinhard, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M. Quittnat, C. Reissel, D. Ruini, D. A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger, L. Shchutska, V. R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, M. L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D. H. Zhu

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

T. K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler⁴⁹, D. Brzhechko, M. F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, S. Donato, C. Galloni, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis, I. Neutelings, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, K. Schweiger, C. Seitz, Y. Takahashi, A. Zucchetta

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

Y. H. Chang, K. y. Cheng, T. H. Doan, R. Khurana, C. M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Pozdnyakov, S. S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

P. Chang, Y. Chao, K. F. Chen, P. H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Arun Kumar, Y. F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand

B. Asavapibhop, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey

M. N. Bakirci⁵⁰, A. Bat, F. Boran, S. Damarseckin, Z. S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, E. Gurpinar, I. Hos⁵¹, C. Isik, E. E. Kangal⁵², O. Kara, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir⁵³, A. Polatoz, D. Sunar Cerci⁵⁴, B. Tali⁵⁴, U. G. Tok, H. Topakli⁵⁰, S. Turkcapar, I. S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Isildak⁵⁵, G. Karapinar⁵⁶, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

I. O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁵⁷, O. Kaya⁵⁸, S. Ozkorucuklu⁵⁹, S. Tekten, E. A. Yetkin⁶⁰

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

M. N. Agaras, A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, Y. Komurcu, S. Sen⁶¹

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine

B. Grynyov

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine

L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

F. Ball, L. Beck, J. J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, O. Davignon, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G. P. Heath, H. F. Heath, L. Kreczko, D. M. Newbold⁶², S. Paramesvaran, B. Penning, T. Sakuma, D. Smith, V. J. Smith, J. Taylor, A. Titterton

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K. W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶³, C. Brew, R. M. Brown, D. Cieri, D. J. A. Cockerill, J. A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C. H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I. R. Tomalin, T. Williams, W. J. Womersley

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Colling, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, M. Komm, C. Laner, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli, J. Nash⁶⁴, A. Nikitenko⁷, V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D. M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, G. Singh, M. Stoye, T. Strebler, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee¹⁶, N. Wardle, D. Winterbottom, J. Wright, S. C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

J. E. Cole, P. R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, C. K. Mackay, A. Morton, I. D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid

Baylor University, Waco, USA

K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, C. Madrid, B. McMaster, N. Pastika, C. Smith

Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

A. Buccilli, S. I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

Boston University, Boston, USA

D. Arcaro, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Pinna, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Brown University, Providence, USA

G. Benelli, X. Coubez, D. Cutts, M. Hadley, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J. M. Hogan⁶⁵, K. H. M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, J. Lee, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Sagir⁶⁶, R. Syarif, E. Usai, D. Yu

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P. T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, W. Ko, O. Kukral, R. Lander, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, M. Shi, D. Stolp, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang, F. Zhang

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, S. Regnard, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, V. Valuev

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

E. Bouvier, K. Burt, R. Clare, J. W. Gary, S. M. A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, E. Kennedy, F. Lacroix, O. R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M. I. Paneva, W. Si, L. Wang, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B. R. Yates

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

J. G. Branson, P. Chang, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, A. Holzner, D. Klein, G. Kole, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁷, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, USA

N. Amin, R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, M. Citron, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, M. Franco Sevilla, L. Gouskos, R. Heller, J. Incandela, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, S. Wang, J. Yoo

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, J. M. Lawhorn, H. B. Newman, T. Q. Nguyen, M. Spiropulu, J. R. Vlimant, R. Wilkinson, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R. Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

M. B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, M. Paulini, M. Sun, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

J. P. Cumalat, W. T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, E. MacDonald, T. Mulholland, R. Patel, A. Perloff, K. Stenson, K. A. Ulmer, S. R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

J. Alexander, J. Chaves, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, A. Datta, K. McDermott, N. Mirman, J. R. Patterson, D. Quach, A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, S. M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, J. Tucker, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L. A. T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P. C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J. N. Butler, A. Canepa, G. B. Cerati, H. W. K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, J. Duarte, V. D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R. M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, M. J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J. M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, C. Pena, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, A. Savoy-Navarro⁶⁸, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W. J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N. V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E. W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H. A. Weber, A. Whitbeck

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, L. Cadamuro, A. Carnes, D. Curry, R. D. Field, S. V. Gleyzer, B. M. Joshi, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, K. H. Lo, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rosenzweig, K. Shi, D. Sperka, J. Wang, S. Wang, X. Zuo

Florida International University, Miami, USA

Y. R. Joshi, S. Linn

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

A. Ackert, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K. F. Johnson, T. Kolberg, G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, A. Saha, C. Schiber, R. Yohay

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M. M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, M. Rahmani, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA

M. R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R. R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer, O. Evdokimov, C. E. Gerber, D. A. Hangal, D. J. Hofman, K. Jung, J. Kamin, C. Mills, I. D. Sandoval Gonzalez, M. B. Tonjes, H. Trauger, N. Varelas, H. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wu, J. Zhang

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

M. Alhusseini, B. Bilki⁶⁹, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz⁷⁰, S. Durgut, R. P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁷¹, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷², A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A. V. Gritsan, W. T. Hung, P. Maksimovic, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, C. You

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, A. Bylinkin, J. Castle, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, C. Rogan, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, J. D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

S. Duric, A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, D. Kim, Y. Maravin, D. R. Mendis, T. Mitchell, A. Modak, A. Mohammadi, L. K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S. C. Eno, Y. Feng, C. Ferraioli, N. J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G. Y. Jeng, R. G. Kellogg, J. Kunkle, A. C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, F. Ricci-Tam, Y. H. Shin, A. Skuja, S. C. Tonwar, K. Wong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, V. Azzolini, A. Baty, G. Bauer, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I. A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, Z. Demiragli, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hsu, M. Hu, Y. Iiyama, G. M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, Y.-J. Lee, P. D. Luckey, B. Maier, A. C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, G. S. F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T. W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, S. Zhaozhong

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

A. C. Benvenuti[†], R. M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, P. Hansen, J. Hiltbrand, Sh. Jain, S. Kalafut, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, M. A. Wadud

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

J. G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, D. R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, F. Golf, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, J. Monroy, J. E. Siado, G. R. Snow, B. Stieger

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, C. Mclean, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roobahani

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, Y. Haddad, A. Hortiangtham, D. M. Morse, T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K. A. Hahn, N. Mucia, N. Odell, M. H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

R. Bucci, N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D. J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, W. Li, N. Loukas,

N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁶, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L. S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, W. Ji, T. Y. Ling, W. Luo, B. L. Winer

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

S. Cooperstein, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, D. Lange, M. T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, D. Stickland, C. Tully

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

S. Malik, S. Norberg

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

A. Barker, V. E. Barnes, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A. W. Jung, A. Khatiwada, B. Mahakud, D. H. Miller, N. Neumeister, C. C. Peng, S. Piperov, H. Qiu, J. F. Schulte, J. Sun, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA

T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, USA

Z. Chen, K. M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F. J. M. Geurts, M. Kilpatrick, W. Li, B. P. Padley, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, W. Shi, Z. Tu, A. Zhang

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y. t. Duh, J. L. Dulemba, C. Fallon, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, P. Tan, R. Taus

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA

A. Agapitos, J. P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walke

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

A. G. Delannoy, J. Heideman, G. Riley, S. Spanier

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

O. Bouhali⁷³, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁷⁴, S. Luo, R. Mueller, D. Overton, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, P. R. Duerdo, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S. W. Lee, T. Mengke, S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, J. D. Ruiz Alvarez, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij, Q. Xu

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

M. W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, R. Hirosky, M. Joyce, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

R. Harr, P. E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, J. Sturdy, P. Thapa, S. Zaleski

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Madison, WI, USA

M. Brodski, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, K. Long, R. Loveless, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, V. Sharma, N. Smith, W. H. Smith, N. Woods

† **Deceased**

- 1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria
- 2: Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- 3: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil
- 4: Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil
- 5: Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium
- 6: Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
- 7: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
- 8: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 9: Now at Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt
- 10: Also at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt
- 11: Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 12: Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt
- 13: Also at Department of Physics, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 14: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 15: Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- 16: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 17: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
- 18: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
- 19: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 20: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 21: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 22: Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
- 23: Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India
- 24: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
- 25: Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India
- 26: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 27: Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran
- 28: Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
- 29: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 30: Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy
- 31: Also at Kyunghee University, Seoul, Korea
- 32: Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- 33: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
- 34: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico
- 35: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
- 36: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 37: Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
- 38: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
- 39: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA
- 40: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
- 41: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA
- 42: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
- 43: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 44: Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia ^a, Università di Pavia ^b, Pavia, Italy
- 45: Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia
- 46: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 47: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia
- 48: Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
- 49: Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics (SMI), Vienna, Austria
- 50: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 51: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey

- 52: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 53: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 54: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 55: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 56: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 57: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 58: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 59: Also at Istanbul University, Faculty of Science, Istanbul, Turkey
- 60: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 61: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- 62: Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
- 63: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 64: Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia
- 65: Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, USA
- 66: Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey
- 67: Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA
- 68: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA
- 69: Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 70: Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
- 71: Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
- 72: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 73: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- 74: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea